BOISE CITY DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
HEARING MINUTES
OCTOBER 14, 2020

I. CALL TO ORDER

PRESENT: Semple
REMOTE: Marsh, Rudeen, Zuckerman, Aguilar
ABSENT: Zabala, Talboy

II. MINUTES

1. Design Review Committee Minutes / September 9, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT:</th>
<th>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOVER:</td>
<td>David Rudeen, Co-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDER:</td>
<td>Zuckerman, Committee Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYES:</td>
<td>Rudeen, Zuckerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSTAIN:</td>
<td>Marsh, Aguilar, Semple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSENT:</td>
<td>Thomas Zabala, Robert W. Talboy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. DEFERRALS

5. DRH20-00408 / Nick Lynch
Location: 10026 N. Eisenman Road
Construct a trucking terminal with a convenience store building, fuel pumps, and associated site improvements on property located in a M-2D (Heavy Industrial with Design Review) zone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT:</th>
<th>DEFERRED [UNANIMOUS]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOVER:</td>
<td>David Rudeen, Co-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDER:</td>
<td>Dana Zuckerman, Committee Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYES:</td>
<td>Marsh, Rudeen, Semple, Zuckerman, Aguilar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSENT:</td>
<td>Thomas Zabala, Robert W. Talboy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next: 11/18/2020 6:00 PM
IV. CONSENT AGENDA

2. **DRH20-00317 / Amy Allgeyer**  
   Location: 615 N. Pierce Street  
   Construct a new single-family residence with waiver requests on a substandard lot of record without alley access in a R-1C (Single-Family Residential) zone.

3. **DRH20-00361 / Eric Anderson, ALC Architecture**  
   Location: 6406 W. Gowen Road  
   Construct two, two-story industrial buildings totaling approximately 54,200 square feet with associated site improvements on property located in a M-1D (Light Industrial with Design Review) zone.

| RESULT: | APPROVED [UNANIMOUS] |
| MOVER:  | David Rudeen, Co-Chair |
| SECONDER: | Jessica Aguilar, Committee Member |
| AYES:    | Marsh, Rudeen, Semple, Zuckerman, Aguilar |
| ABSENT:  | Thomas Zabala, Robert W. Talboy |

V. NEW BUSINESS

1. **CVA20-00008 / Danny Pardee, Image National**  
   Location: 702 W Idaho Street  
   Variance to exceed the maximum background area for a proposed wall sign in a C-5DDC (Central Business with Downtown Design Review and Capitol Boulevard Special Design District) zone.

   **Katelyn Menuge (City of Boise):** This is a sign variance request in the Capitol Boulevard Special Design Review District. The process for these is that the Design Review Committee forwards a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission. That Planning and Zoning Commission hearing is tentatively for November 9th. This will be a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

   The subject property is at the corner of Idaho Street and Capitol Boulevard. It is the Key Bank building. The bright red square is the subject parcel and then they also have an attached parking garage, but that is on a separate parcel.

   Here is a view as if you’re standing in front of City Hall on Capitol Boulevard looking towards the Capitol Building. Here is the subject
building. This is Idaho Street, and this is the subject sign they would like to replace.

The existing sign was approved in 2010, and from our documentation on that sign, it does conform with the current standards which limit the sign area to 65 square feet in the Capitol Boulevard Overlay. This sign is approximately 60 square feet.

Here we have the existing sign. You see the Key Bank words are above the key logo. They would like to refresh the sign to match their current branding. The Key Bank, you can see is front of the key now and both the Key Bank words and the key logo are proposed to be larger than the existing sign, but they don't come any closer to that Capitol Boulevard corridor. They are the same distance away from that building edge. Here is the proposed sign. It is approximately 44 feet long and approximately 7 feet tall.

Here is an outline of the Capitol Boulevard Special Design Overlay. So, you can see it is about a block on either side of Capitol Boulevard. Within that district there are special sign requirements. The applicant is asking for a variance to 2., “That the wall signs shall not exceed 15-percent of the wall area and size or 65 square feet, whichever is less”. Their proposal is 277 square feet so that would exceed that maximum of 65 square feet.

We also have the variance criteria for approving a variance. There are variance criteria that apply to all variances and there are variance criteria for signs specifically. We can go through these quick.

A variance has to meet 1., 2., and 3. of B. So, there's either a hardship associated with the property itself or an exceptional circumstance relating to the intended use of the property that is not generally applicable to the district.

We have granting of the variance.

1. Will not be in conflict with the Comprehensive Plan and will not affect a change in zoning.

2. Will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare.
3. *Injurious to the property or improvements of other property owners, or the quiet enjoyment thereof.*

All three of those have to be met in order to approve a variance.

Then as well, we have the Special Sign Variance criteria.

- A *Sign Variance may not be applied to a sign that is prohibited.* This is a wall sign which is an allowed sign type so, that one they will have met.

- *Nonconforming signs in the vicinity surrounding the subject site may not be used as justification for a special circumstance.* We can’t look at other signs nearby that are nonconforming in order to support the variance.

If we go through these, that first one, that there’s either a hardship associated with the property itself or an exceptional circumstance and it can’t be applicable to the district in general. It has to be something that is site specific. The applicant has pointed out that the other development in the area blocks their visibility which is important for their signage. That the sign is small in comparison to the large building façade and the proposed sign will not be more visible from the Capitol Boulevard corridor than the existing sign.

The applicant has put together a little map that shows where the building signage is and is not visible. You can see generally from the east and the west those are the more visible areas.

They also have some photos they’ve pointed out to see how visible the sign is from different areas. From the Boise Depot, this is an iconic view that we try to keep uncluttered and we want to preserve the view of the Capitol. You can see that the Key Bank Building is not visible from here. So, the existing sign or the proposed sign is not visible. By the time you get in front of City Hall that’s when the sign is visible. So, from in front of City Hall you can see the sign here will look larger because this entire façade here is visible. Then we have on the connector the Key Bank is right about here so probably not very visible. Then this from 9th Street. So, this position is probably visible, but you’re quite a distance away. Then they have a photo taken from Idaho Street at night, so the existing sign is lit, and they are proposing that the new sign also be lit. Here is a view from Main and 5th Street. You can see it is visible, but you’re pretty far away.
Then that second variance criteria that, “Granting of the variance will not be in conflict with the Comprehensive Plan and will not affect a change in zoning”. The applicant didn’t go too much into this in their application materials, but gateway streets are pointed out in our Comprehensive Plan to “Enhance the area and overall character”.

Then the Design Standards intend to “Limit signage to reduce clutter and enhance the pedestrian environment”. It’s definite to see that they provided enough information for us to meet that finding.

Third, that “Granting of the Variance will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare”. There are residential condos across Idaho Street, and we did receive a couple of comments concerned mainly about the light. I think we didn’t have this information when putting the packet together, but I think the applicant has more information about what they are willing to do with the lighting. Then of course a larger sign is going to be more visually intrusive than the existing sign.

So, based on this analysis we are recommending that we forward a recommendation of denial to the Planning and Zoning Commission just on the fact that there wasn’t enough information provided that shows those variance findings were clearly met. But I think the applicant does have some more information available so maybe they can clarify some of that further. Alternatively, you can forward a recommendation of approval of the sign as it is proposed. You’d need to clearly state how those variance findings are met or you can forward a recommendation of approval of the sign variance with some additional conditions. Again, just show how those findings are going to be met. I think the applicant is here and can maybe add some extra information and points.

Committee Member Rudeen: Can I request that staff, I know that the square footage and the amount of signage along Capitol Boulevard has been updated at some point. Can you tell me when the last time it was updated?

Katelyn Menuge: What I found was that in 1998 we had the 65 square foot and at that point this building did exist. We did have some taller buildings in the area and that’s when we have the 65 square feet called out.
Applicant Testimony

Mike Dardis (Image National Signs / Intermountain Business Manager): Key Bank would like to update the existing sign to match their current linear logo and in doing so provide a little bit more visibility for that sign. Currently the existing sign is primarily visible from the east due to the stacked format of that sign. With the newer linear sign, it would be visible more from the east and the west. In doing so, that would provide more visibility and generally speaking, advertisement for Key Bank. With the new mural that has been painted on the west side of the building there is a lot of photography being done or photographs that are being taken of the building. With the new layout they would certainly be in some of those images or photographs that are being taken thus, being an advantage to them and keep them relevant and competing with other banks in the area.

The existing sign is 8-foot, 1-inch overall in height. The new sign would be 7-foot, 11-inches so the overall height of the new sign to the existing sign are comparable. It’s just that the new sign would be longer.

As far as the impact of the Downtown corridor...I guess our hardship is essentially the same as the advantage when it comes to the impact on the corridor that would be limited. With the building across the street, the Tower Plaza blocking our primary signing area the overall visibility is limited unless you’re again, coming from the east or the west.

As far as the illumination goes of the sign, we are able to or willing to concede and limit the hours of illumination. Perhaps we turn off the sign at 11:00 p.m. and it comes back on at 5:00 a.m. or something along those lines. We understand there are condos across the street and the residents there have some concerns.

As previously noted, there’s no increased visibility of the sign from the Capitol corridor...Capitol Boulevard. That, I think is about it. Any questions for me?

Committee Member Rudeen: Mr. Dardis, you talked about limiting the hours for the sign being lit. The new sign will have X amount of
light being pumped out of it…foot-candles or whatever. How does that compare to what the existing sign has?

**Mike Dardis:** Actually, the lit level or illumination level will be comparable to what is there now. The new sign will not be brighter.

**Committee Member Semple:** Do you currently limit the hours that the current sign is illuminated?

**Mike Dardis:** The current sign is illuminated from dusk to dawn…all night long.

**Committee Member Zuckerman:** Would you be willing to turn off the sign a little bit earlier? Something like 10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. 11:00 p.m. to 5:00 a.m. sounds a little bit harsh for something that is illuminated directly across from condos.

**Mike Dardis:** I understand your point and I do think that’s valid. I think we can concede and do that, yes.

**No Neighborhood Association Testimony**

**No Public Testimony**

**Applicant Rebuttal**

**Mike Dardis:** I would just like to emphasize the overall design of the sign is consistent with their logo and the displays that they’ve installed in other cities across the country. There again, just trying to remain a viable business and community partner in the City of Boise and gain some advertisement if you will, with the larger sign. I appreciate your time. Thank you.

**Committee Deliberations**

**Chairman Marsh:** With that, we did get some information from the public that they weren’t necessarily not in support of the sign, but they did wish to have the hours limited to, as you had mentioned, from like 10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. The applicant seems to be in agreement with that.

Other items that they listed…it seems like their variance was due to the height of the buildings where the wall facing direction, facing south on Capitol, provides very limited visibility to that sign and
that’s their main variance, that it has limited distance. It doesn’t seem to have a real impact to pedestrians that I could see since it’s at such a height on a large building.

Any other thoughts, questions or concerns?

Committee Member Zuckerman: Looking at the current sign and the proposed sign, the proposed sign is far more in scale with the building than the current sign. Which, honestly, looks a little bit dinky for lack of a better term. I agree that there’s no adverse consequences to putting up a larger sign and I can see why the applicant wants to have a larger sign. You really can’t see the current sign from any distance and you definitely cannot see it from the street below. It took me a few years to realize that that was the Key Bank Building that people were referring to because the sign is just not visible. I fully support the proposed sign.

Chairman Marsh: Quick question to staff. On the west facing wall that has a mural on it now, did that previously have signage on it recently for Key Bank?

Katelyn Menuge: I don’t believe there was any signage on that side.

Chairman Marsh: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Aguilar: I’m not in support of granting a variance. We have a lot of new structures that are getting built and getting into the skyline here. Over time, as these new structures are added their sign packages are going to come in and I think it’s really important that we are consistent with the current standards and requirements. Now, if staff, Planning and Zoning, and City Council at some point want to revisit the sign ordinance, and maybe the ordinance should be revised, but I don’t think it’s appropriate to set a precedent here as we have other buildings coming online here soon and hopefully more in the future. I don’t think there’s really a hardship associated with the existing sign size. Thank you.

Commissioner Rudeen: I would concur with those last comments. Basically, I don’t see the hardship or the exceptional nature that the sign needs to be changed. We want to be pretty careful not to get into the habit of increasing the clutter however anybody wants to define clutter that goes along that Capitol Boulevard district. If Planning and Zoning wants to change the criteria for that sign, then
let them have at it. I think we punted on the Grove Hotel and a few of those things back to Planning and Zoning. Like the hotel up the street for this very reason. I would hate for us to set that precedent. If they want to increase the size of these signs, then I think that’s their function. Yeah, it might look right and might look more in balance with the building. You’re not going to be able to see it from Capitol Boulevard until you’re upon it whether it’s bigger or smaller. There are all kinds of criteria here, but I don’t see any of it as a hardship.

Committee Member Zuckerman: It looks like the precedent has already been set. The Grove Hotel received a variance and I believe in the packet there were two other signs in the Capitol corridor that received variances. I understand from the staff presentation that we aren’t supposed to compare this proposal for the new sign with any other signs. So, I would imagine in the future that this could not be counted as precedent setting.

Committee Member Semple: I can see kind of the point that we would not necessarily be setting a precedent here, but on the same hand we can’t use the past signs that have been approved as a reason to approve this one also. I think it boils down to, in my mind, there’s not really a hardship that’s being shown. I understand that it’s not visible from Capitol Boulevard and maybe design wise it fits better with the building, but being a recommendation to Planning and Zoning, I feel like if they want to take on a modification to it or they decide the variance is appropriate at that level...since we’re just recommending, they could go against our recommendation regardless of what we send to them.

In the case of not using other signs or using other signs I don’t think we can look at anything that’s happened in the past and we just have to take this on an individual basis. I don’t see a hardship or exceptional circumstance other than their sign is too small and they’d like to have better advertising. Which, I’m sure a lot of businesses would as well, but we hold them to that same standard that’s set in the Sign Code right now.

Committee Member Semple moved that the Committee forward a recommendation of denial to the Planning and Zoning Commission for CVA20-00008.

Committee member Rudeen seconded.
Chairman Marsh: From what I’ve heard there wasn’t particularly a lot of opposition to the sign design, scale wise to the building even from the illumination times that they were considering. However, from our side, the Committee has not been able to identify a hardship and that’s why we are forwarding onto to Planning and Zoning this recommendation of denial. Does that surmise people’s thoughts?

Committee Member Semple: Yes.

Committee Member Aguilar: Yes.

Chairman Marsh: If there’s no other discussion at this time, Victoria could you please call the roll?

RESULT: DENIED [4 TO 1]
MOVER: Ben Semple, Committee Member
SECONDER: David Rudeen, Co-Chair
AYES: James Marsh, David Rudeen, Ben Semple, Jessica Aguilar
NAYS: Dana Zuckerman
ABSENT: Thomas Zabala, Robert W. Talboy

4. DRH20-00383 / Dennis Taggart
Location: 1160 N. Maple Grove Road
Construct six duplex residential buildings with associated site improvements on property located in a R-3D (Multi-family Residential with Design Review) zone.

KayCee Downey (City of Boise): The project is for the construction of six, two-story duplex structures for a total of 12 units which is less than the allowed density on the lot which is 31 units. The property is located R-3D Zone which is our Multi-Family Residential zone. The project is allowed by density for use, so it does not require conditional use approval from Planning and Zoning. The applicant has agreed to all conditions of approval, but we had some concerns from the public.

For context these are some photos taken at the corners of the existing property. This is also a very rough color blocking of the general uses in the area. As you can see, this a rather mixed-use neighborhood. We see a lot of commercial, largely auto sales, some office, as well as a daycare, and some multi-family adjacent to the proposed development as well as some single-family development.
The proposed elevations break up the façades reducing the impact of the two-story structures. We are going to require three color pallets. They show a gray pallet in this image. They’ve also provided some information for a brown tone pallet. We’re going to require a third one because this development and the size of it doesn’t require differing the actual form of the structures, so we find that having different colors help add some more design variety. So, when you look at the development from either street, Irving, Maple Grove or Susan, we’re going to see different colors.

The site design has the structures pushed up against the street as well as an internal drive that the residents would access garages from. Per comments received by ACHD that were received as late correspondence, the applicant is going to be required to restructure part of Susan Drive.

Site parking seems to be the main concern for the public, so I wanted to focus most of the attention here. Site parking is found within the Boise City Zoning Code. It is not within the Design Review Guidelines. So, it is something specific to the Planning and Zoning Commission and not within the jurisdiction or purview of the Design Review Committee to alter. So, what is required on this is 23 parking stalls. Multi-family parking is determined based off of the number of rooms in each unit. Each unit has three bedrooms which require 1.5 parking stalls each for a total of 18 stalls. We also require additional guest parking for one. Also, if there is assigned parking, we do require an increase of 20-percent. This is not specifically applicable to this design since they are using individual garages. It is more relevant when it is a flat parking lot, residential or office, but we did do these calculations to ensure that with the assigned parking we still have that 20-percent increase. What is provided by the applicant is 24 stalls, so each unit has its own two-car garage, so two parking stalls. In addition to the 24 stalls on-site which meets the required parking, the applicant indicated an additional on-street parking stalls adjacent to the property. Per the multi-family guidelines of the Boise City Zoning Code we are able to actually reduce the number of on-site parking stalls if there are adjacent on-street parking stalls. We’re not doing that here. We see that the project does have the appropriate required parking on-site. But having on-site parking stalls does give the opportunity for some overflow if needed as long as there are no restrictions on the streets.
We did have some late public comments that were forwarded to the Committee this morning. They are provided by Karen Spencer who is the owner of property located at 8865 and 8867 Irving Street. Since they weren’t sure if they were going to be able to present today, I wanted to provide some context to show that their property is near the subject property, so their duplex is just one away. Their comments were primarily concern about parking and that there wouldn’t be sufficient stalls for residents on site. There’s also concern that there is already overflow parking on the street so those six on-street parking stalls wouldn’t necessary be available to this site. There are also concerns about who would necessarily live in this development. Concerns that each unit would have three vehicles. Those are the primary summaries of the comments.

We did have some comments submitted shortly before the hearing by a separate member of the public. Unfortunately, they were submitted too late to be able to accept them into the record and give them to the Committee. I believe this individual will be on record and testify virtually today.

Staff’s recommendation for the project is to approve DRH20-00383 as recommended with the conditions of approval. With that I think it is most appropriate to have the applicant speak and then we can get to some public commentary.

**Applicant Testimony**

**Dennis Taggart (Applicant’s Architect):** Thank you for making yourselves available in whatever form it is during this time. It is greatly appreciated. I appreciate staff’s help through this.

We really aren’t asking for anything outside of what is required. We have the required setbacks; we have no structure over two stories which is compatible with the development directly to our east, which is a combination of two stories. It’s much less, of course, than the new apartments to the south which are three stories. Our setbacks are within code. We have a significant pedestrian way around the property and through the property. The design is such that we’re working on a concept of community neighborhood in each area where the entryways is on an interior patio as compared to facing the streets.

In regard to the parking we have provided, if you consider our full proposal, about 50-percent more than is actually required by code.
We also are showing in our...understanding that the transit stop in front of our project needs a shelter, we have designed our project to accommodate a typical parking area there which of course in concept reduces the amount of vehicles and traffic within our project. We think that while there is no guarantee that there wouldn’t be three adults driving three cars, most people have a typical family, which is two people and children. I also feel that in today’s (climate?) and I think it will be proven out, based on what I’m hearing in the workplace, is there is going to continue to be a work from home option for a lot of people and a lot of people taking that opportunity. I think one of the bedrooms very likely will become a workspace for at least some of the folks.

In regard to the off-street parking I understand that there, particularly with the new apartments next door, seems to be, according to the comments that I’ve seen a concern about the additional parking on the street. While that may be true, it is a first-come, first-serve situation. So, if there was a need for off-site parking as a result, either residents or their guests, it’s no worse than the development to the east of us and to the south of us.

We think that’s it’s reasonable that we have been able to provide what we’ve done. We’ve bent over backwards to accommodate trash, fire, and pedestrian traffic with the transit stop as well. We think it’s a good project for the site. It’s a very visible empty site now that we’re taken down the old dilapidated house that was there. I think this is a very, very good and compatible use. A good blend between the three-story commercial apartment look and the residential look not only to our east, but to some degree the single-family across the street. We really don’t know what else we would be able to do on this site efficiently to serve not only the development needs for the people, but also the service needs of fire and sanitary.

**Neighborhood Association Testimony**

**Karen Spencer**: I will say we do have serious concerns. Our section of Irving Street is literally 1/10 of a mile. That’s 1/10 of a mile with homes, with fire hydrant, mailbox(es) and driveways. I understand he is saying that all of the restrictions or everything has been met, but I think that we also need to be very realistic.

The apartments that were just constructed are two-bedroom apartments. Those are currently housing at least three adults just to afford the $1,400 a month rent. I don’t know if you’re familiar with
This area, but this is not a high-end area. People will be looking out their windows and seeing a 1970’s double-wide across the street.

This property that they’re proposing is like creating an island. This small section of parcel will be consumed by this construction and they are going to be dependent on our little 1/10 of a mile and Susan which is a dead-end to support this parking. It is a fairly narrow residential street. We have children that utilize this street every day to cross and go to Horizon Elementary. We just have serious concerns. They’re not providing the parking and I don’t believe a two-car garage can qualify as guest parking. My guests do not park in my garage and they’re not providing anything other than garage parking. That is our biggest concern. I’m speaking for everybody on our street. Any questions?

Sarah Christensen (8875 Irving Street, #101): I’m in a condominium and Karen is my backyard neighbor and the proposed units are to the west of me.

Just like Karen I speak on behalf of several of my neighbors that I’ve spoken to and I can guarantee when I have time to go and talk to more, they’re going to have the same concerns.

When Rosewood was put in and as they filled up, their parking has flowed out onto Susan. Susan is now zero extra parking. When Karen and I went walking last night at 8:00 p.m. where the development is currently being proposed there were 20 cars just using it as a parking lot. So, when this development goes in those cars are going to relocate to Irving Street. I understand it is first-come, first-serve and I know it’s a public street, so they’ll be coming over.

I was the person who submitted her comments late. To be honest with you I’ve never…this is my first time at a public hearing.

I can tell you that on Susan Street there are about 10 spaces and on Irving Street there are about 27 spaces leaving a total number of street parking of 37 spaces. I can tell you that right now there are about 18 residents between Maple Grove Estates. I didn’t even mention that at the end of Irving Street it goes through, but it ends at Maple Grove Estates which is a trailer park. Those residents, their streets are so narrow they are not allowed to park on the street so they kind of flow back onto Irving Street. 10 of this 18 is…I counted that on Susan because that’s already used. I did not count the 20.
Here are the 20 that was parked last night. There is zero street parking. There is zero.

Again, I'm going to reiterate the same points that Karen made. I'm sorry if I'm just restating the same thing, but again these are 12 three-bedroom units and they only have garages. I would like this Committee to consider for a moment all of the two-car garages that you know of. Friends, family and neighbors. Of those two-car garages, how many of them have two cars parked in the garage. Of the ten that I knew off the top of my head I could only think of one and they only cleared out in time for winter. The vast majority have one car in the garage and one bay of storage. With their second car and often third cars parked in the driveway. Tranquility is not proposing to provide a driveway for their residents so all other resident cars and all guests...and like Karen says, who has your grandma come park in your garage? They're going to have to go try to find street parking and it doesn't exist.

A couple more points that I do want to point out is like Karen said from the Maple Grove Estates and kids around here. We have a lot of kids coming through. Once Irving Street gets double parked with cars, we have service vehicles, our condominium association has a lawn service that comes in, there are garbage vehicles that have got to come through. On behalf of my neighbors and owners who I've spoken for, we have a great concern over traffic and safety of our kids with all of the parking that's just not going to be there.

I think a traffic study on Irving would show it's a very busy little tenth mile and I feel the Committee would join us in our concerns if they had a chance to see what we see on a daily basis. There is zero parking. I thank you for your time.

Committee Member Zuckerman: Sarah, I'm just curious and I'm really not being facetious here...you live next to an empty lot. Is there something that would go in there that would be acceptable.

Sarah Christensen: I was thinking about that and I was looking at the designs and I actually think those buildings are beautiful. One of the things I had thought of was instead of...I'm not saying that this is what they should do...if they provided covered parking...we have them here, carports. Covered parking means that people aren't going to put storage there and that means they are going to utilize both spaces. I think my main concern is when you have a garage, you're going to have one car in there and not two. But
let’s assume for a minute they do have two. Again, I know that in the packet that taking out one unit…they would need to take out one unit to…if they only had one entrance…I know I’m getting a little muddled. They said they couldn’t take out one unit to allow that. I guess the other proposal I would have made was, could you take out one or two units to provide additional guest/resident parking for their people. The same design, but just more parking.

This is the first time I’ve ever spoken at a Design Committee…yeah, improvement on that site would be beautiful. It’s an empty, ugly lot and there are overgrown blackberry bushes we’d love to get rid of. It’s just that we’re not going to be able to sustain the parking.

The other thing that I was going to say that I forgot. There’s not like other streets. If you were doing this over across…there is another empty lot kitty-corner which is currently zoned for commercial and that’s a whole other issue, but if you were proposing this there, there are like 35…it’s a whole neighborhood of streets where if my grandma came and there wasn’t immediate street parking…well, if my grandma comes to visit I’m going to have to move my car across Maple Grove…on the other side of Maple Grove on those residential streets and then I’m going to use the crosswalk to come back and leave my parking space for my grandma to park in, right off of my house. I am part of the condo association and we do have a couple more guest parking (spots) so my grandma’s going to be fine, but any of the other residents or even the guests of this development are going to have to park, like I said, across Maple Grove. There is a walkway to facilitate that, but it is a considerable walk. There’s no other little street that would allow them to park close-ish or even reasonable. Sorry if I got to winded there.

**Applicant Rebuttal**

**Dennis Taggart:** Thank you for this opportunity. I appreciate very much not only the concern and the efforts that these two ladies put forth. It’s their home, I get it. Having said that, I don’t know how you can punish this development to the sins of others or for the on-street parking that is currently there which we will be competing with the one we have to provide for our own offset. Yes, there is an electronic stop walkway right directly across from our property so there are additional opportunities across Maple Grove.

Garages and carports. Garages are an issue in some developments for sure, but when you are having to provide for
yourself, you’re going to make sure you’re going to provide for yourself. That means are they maybe out competing for those spots? Of course, we’re only talking about a guest, but if they choose to try to park on the street and save the garage for storage that is an issue that is beyond Planning and Zoning and beyond the developer. It’s a social issue we’re having to deal with, but I don’t know how we can ask this developer to impact his income stream by a minimum of 20-percent and 40-percent or 35-percent if we take away the two units in order to provide parking that’s not needed to meet the code. If we were trying to exceed the code or we were asking for the reduction because of public transportation for the code, then I think you might have some legs because that’s at the discretion of the Planning Director. We’re not asking for any reductions there. We’re only asking for a single spot to meet the staff recommendation. There are two spots available right up against Maple Grove which would obviously be a secondary for anybody else looking at their two spots beyond, back toward the east that are directly adjacent. I would say that this developer and his tenants have just as much right to compete for those as does the apartments across the street and the condos and the folks there.

Again, the fact that there’s a squeeze based on the mobile home park is a long-term issue and it’s again, not addressed in the Zoning Code to affect us there. We’re not responsible for something that’s out anywhere from a tenth by her measurements to her property, but that mobile home park is about a ¼ mile away.

As much as I empathize with them, there are guards for the children as far as getting across the street, we do have a 5-foot sidewalk on both sides of our property. I think we’ve met the code and done our best to have a good compatible project. I just don’t think it’s right to ask this developer to compromise when the others have not been. Thank you very much.

Can I say one more thing, we will be happy to work with those homeowners if we wanted to try to do something to limit the parking like petition district by permit or something, we’ll work with them to try to figure out a problem because we’re neighbors then. Thank you.

Public Portion Closed

Chairman Marsh: Any comments or thoughts at this point and time? Probably a similar set of concerns as we’ve had on multiple
developments whether they be in the North End or across the valley. In this case, they are somewhat in excess of the minimum on our code. Other thoughts and concerns? Seems to mostly be developed around parking issues.

Committee Member Semple: As the applicant stated and I think we all understand parking and traffic is major issue in Boise regardless of where you live. It seems like there’s always parking problems. That doesn’t seem to be something that we necessarily will address at Design Review, but the applicant has done a really good job of exceeding the parking spaces per unit.

The number of units on the site is well below what is allowable there, which I think can’t be lost also. They’ve already made a concession by limiting the number of units that they’re actually building on the site when they could build 31 units on the site instead of 12. Based on the staff’s analysis of six on-street parking spaces where one would be required for code for quest parking and two is maybe more appropriate with 12, but regardless I think we need to be careful. What we don’t want to see is Boise develop into is a bunch of parking lots.

We need to start looking as a community at alternative transportation methods. I know this is a little bit further out, but if there is a public transit route adjacent, the applicant is not requesting a parking reduction at all and it has a lot of things going for it that they could have requested. A reduction or limiting the number of parking spaces to 1½ per unit with surface parking. There’s been times, during the winter, where carports fail under snow load. They are not as attractive in terms of design when you’re looking at a site.

So, I’m going to support the approval of the application because I think it checks a lot of the boxes of what we’re looking for. I think having a denser development could be appropriate, but they’re keeping it more at residential scale right in an area with commercial, obviously education as well as other residential multi-family and single-family so I think it’s very appropriate.

Chairman Marsh: Other thoughts or a motion?

COMMITTEE MEMBER RUDEEN MOVED TO APPROVE DRH20-00383 AS RECOMMENDED IN THE FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSION OF LAW
AND RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL NOTED IN THE PROJECT REPORT.

COMMITTEE MEMBER AGUILAR SECONDED.

Committee Member Zuckerman: Is it appropriate to ask staff a question at this time?

Chairman Marsh: Yes, we can have discussion.

Committee Member Zuckerman: I’m curious about, in the staff presentation, the different browns that are going to be used? Just looking at the pictures, it is not a conventional style building and I’m wondering why we’re requesting that they use different browns. I think that’s a matter of taste and not necessarily...I don’t think it really does anything as far as breaking up massing because these are not oversized buildings for this site.

Then the other thing is there are many different rooflines in these buildings and I just wanted to know if that was something that the applicant did. Staff, I know this is conjecture to comply with some of our guidelines, because I’m wondering if we need to change those guidelines, so we don’t have so many rooflines in one structure. Both because I think it looks a little bit busy and because I wonder if it adds to the cost of building and thus to the cost of rental? Sorry that was a lot in one question.

KayCee Downey: As for the colors we’re not requiring different shades of brown per say. We’re requiring three separate color pallets. One of the color pallets that they propose as you can see up here are browns. That’s just one of the color pallets...that would be one of them. The other ones would have to be different colors. What we see when we request different color pallets is, they need to complimentary, but distinct. Typically, we were seeing tans and browns for one color pallet and we’re then seeing either grays or we’re seeing some neutral lighter blues as well as some neutral greens. We see they are complimentary, but they also distinguish the buildings. The requirement for this is to add some additional design variety because we do not have requirements to have different designed buildings on a development this size. So, instead of having separate buildings to help create the design variety, the colors kind of add some design variety from the street so it’s not just one wall of tans or one wall of grays. That’s the justification for the color pallets. The browns will just be one of the potential pallets.
As for the rooflines, we don't regulate architectural style. With the Design Review Guidelines, we do require some modulation. We like to have varied rooflines, but we don't require how many different rooflines. We don't have a standard there, but we do like to see varied rooflines because it adds design variety. It also helps break up the massing. So, instead of having just one larger structure, having the varied rooflines kind of reduces the impact and we particularly like to see this when it is surrounded by single-family or it’s transitioning towards single-family homes. Design Guidelines just like to see having...we don't require the number of roofline changes, but we do like to see them. Again, we don't require the number of them, but we view it as a positive.

RESULT:  APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:  David Rudeen, Co-Chair
SECONDER:  Jessica Aguilar, Committee Member
AYES:  Marsh, Rudeen, Semple, Zuckerman, Aguilar
ABSENT:  Thomas Zabala, Robert W. Talboy

VI.  ADJOURNMENT